THE REMONSTRANCE
AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE

BOSTON, APRIL, 1916

The Remonstrance is published quarterly by the Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts. It expresses the views of women in Massachusetts, Maine, Rhode Island, New York, Nebraska, Iowa, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Connecticut, Maryland, New Hampshire, Vermont, New Jersey, South Dakota, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Ohio, Virginia and other states.

Any one who desires to receive the quarterly numbers for one year can do so by enclosing 25 cents in stamps to the Treasurer,

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN,
Walnut St., Brookline.

Information in regard to The Remonstrance and other publications of the Association may be obtained from the Secretary, Room 615, Kensington Building, Boston.

Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts

One hundred and thirty seven Branch Committees; 36,761 members in 443 cities, towns, and villages*

MRS. JOHN BALCH, President
MRS. GEORGE R. AGASSIZ
MRS. ROBERT S. BRADLEY
MISS ANNA L. DAWES
MRS. CHARLES E. GUILD
MRS. FRANCIS C. LOWELL
MRS. HENRY M. WHITNEY
— Vice Presidents
MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN, Treasurer
Walnut Street, Brookline.
MISS MARY S. AMES, Chairman of Executive Committee
MRS. WILLIAM LOWELL PUTNAM — Chairman of Education and Organization Committee, Chairman of County Committee
MRS. EDWIN FORD, Vice Chairman, County Committee.
MRS. B. L. ROBINSON, President Public Interests League
MRS. A. J. GEORGE, Field Secretary
MRS. S. REED ANTHONY, Rec. Sec'y.
MRS. CHARLES P. STRONG, Cor. Sec'y, Room 615, Kensington Building, Boston.

* *Net present membership of women over 21 years of age; eliminating those names which the Association has lost from deaths, resignations, and removals from the State*

A WORD WITH THE BRANCHES

THE REMONSTRANCE ventures to remind the branches of the Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts—though there may be little need of such a reminder—that the splendid victory of the 2nd of November does not do away with the necessity of continued anti-suffrage activity.

The immediate strain of the campaign is over. There is, of course, less need of active work within the state than in the months when the question was about to be submitted to the voters. But this interval of relief from the arduous work of the campaign should be utilized to extend and strengthen the organization, and to keep it in readiness for whatever emergencies may arise. It is not the habit of the suffragists to accept an expression of the popular will, even when it is as emphatic and unmistakable as was the verdict of the voters of Massachusetts last November. By devices covert or open, seeking this concession or that, they will continue their struggle, and anti-suffragists must be ready to resist them.

Anti-suffragists in Massachusetts and the other three great Eastern States which have just rejected suffrage amendments must remember that this is one cause—East, West and South; and that victory or defeat in one section is an encouragement or handicap in all the others. Iowa, South Dakota and West Virginia—this year's campaign States—make a strong claim for sympathy and support upon the great Eastern States which have just fought their own campaigns to a successful finish. This is especially true of Iowa, where the issue goes to the voters at the primaries in June, almost on the eve of the assembling of the great national conventions. But it is true also of the other two states. The National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage should have the immediate and generous support of all of the branches of the Massachusetts Association in the work which it is doing in organizing and strengthening the anti-suffrage sentiment in those States. The end to be kept in view is not merely to defeat suffrage in this State or that, but to defeat it everywhere, so that it may be apparent that its advance is definitely halted. If the splendid anti-suffrage victories of 1914 and 1915 are followed by similar victories in the group of States voting this year, we shall have gone far toward achieving that result.

The repeated suffrage attacks upon Congress also, and the desperate attempt of the suffragists to secure through a Federal amendment what they cannot get through appeals to the voters, make it necessary for anti-suffragists everywhere to cooperate in effectively resisting them.

THE REMONSTRANCE is far from advising the branches to follow the example of the suffragists in restricting their gifts and activities to this one cause. On the contrary, it recommends active participation in whatever forms of benevolent or relief work most appeal to them. Combined work in any of these directions will only strengthen the tie which binds the branches together for anti-suffrage. The history of the Public Interests League which, in affiliation with the Anti-Suffrage Association and under its auspices, has done splendid work for Belgian Relief, Polish Relief and the Red Cross, is sufficient proof of this.

AND WHY NOT?

THE WOMAN'S JOURNAL of January 15 made an absurd and characteristic attempt to create a scandal out of a perfectly simple matter. Under "scare" headlines which would have looked well in one of Mr. Hearst's journals—"Real Force Behind 'Women's' Anti Movement Uncovered" "Societies Which Claim to Speak for Eighty Per Cent. of Women Received Eighty Per Cent. of Contributions in Home State from Men representing Moneyed Interests"— it printed figures compiled from the official reports of anti-suf-

frage contributions filed with the Secretary of State.

Among the alleged startling disclosures made by The Woman's Journal under these "scare" headlines were such facts as these:

(1) By far the greater part of the anti-suffrage campaign fund was made up of personal contributions as distinct from fairs, rummage sales, dances, etc.

(2) Four-fifths of these personal contributions, or $39,234, were made by men. Contributions amounting to only $9,585, were made by women.

This, with further computations showing the average contribution per man.

Now, in the name of plain, ordinary common sense, what is there in this for The Woman's Journal to be excited about? Is there anything sacred about "fairs, rummage sales and dances" as sources of revenue that Massachusetts anti-suffragists are to be criticised for not confining themselves to them? Is it upon fairs, rummage sales and dances that the suffragists relied for the $150,000 which they have just raised for lobbying Congress?

And, as to personal contributions, why should not the husbands, fathers and sons of conservative Massachusetts women, realizing the menace to womanhood and the State involved in forcing women into politics against their will, give generously to help the women in fighting against this menace? That is what these men did whom The Woman's Journal holds up to obloquy as if they had done something nefarious. There was never any secrecy nor any reason for secrecy about the matter. All through the campaign, the Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts and the Men's Anti-Suffrage Committee worked together for the common cause; and the Women's Association acknowledges gratefully the help in time, money and energy of the Men's Committee.

With all its keen scent for non-existent scandal, The Woman's Journal was unable to find evidence of *a single dollar coming from any sinister source or spent in any improper way*. Considering the story which it set afloat early in the campaign to the effect that the saloon interests were raising eight million dollars to fight the suffrage amendment, it must have been a bitter disappointment to find not the slightest trace of any such activity.

AN ARMED TRUCE

THE relations at present existing between those rival organizations, the Congressional Union and the National Woman Suffrage Association, may best be described as an armed truce.

For the present, there is an agreement upon the immediate end in view —the bringing of pressure upon Congress for favorable action on the Susan B. Anthony suffrage amendment. But there is as sharp a difference as ever between the two organizations as to the method to be adopted — the Congressional Union insisting upon holding the party in power responsible for whatever is done or fails to be done, and proposing to "blacklist" that party if the action of Congress is not satisfactory; while the National Woman Suffrage Association proposes to limit its "blacklisting" to individual members of either party who prove intractable. There is also a difference of policy as to state campaigns, the Congressional Union holding that it is idle and humiliating to go on appealing to the voters in the several states, and that the thing to do is to concentrate all effort, first upon Congress, and later upon state legislatures, in the hope of dodging the voters altogether; while the National Association is not inclined to abandon its work in the states, although it has come into line with the Congressional Union in concentrating its exertions in Congress upon the Susan B. Anthony amendment.

But the difference between the two organizations is not one of policy merely. It is a difference also of temper. The Congressional Union, which owes its origin and its present leadership to immediate disciples of Mrs. Pankhurst, is committed to an American adaptation of the Pankhurst methods. It is intensely radical in its ideals and its practices. It wants to smash things. In particular, it wants to smash the National Woman Suffrage Association. As some of its leaders have characteristically expressed it, it believes that the National Association has "gone to seed"; and it proposes to supplant that venerable organization with something of a later pattern and more up-to-date. So it goes on extending its organization in the several states, showing scant courtesy to the state suffrage associations already in the field. At last accounts, it had completed its organization in twenty-six states; and its campaign fund for use in Congress was well above the $100,000 figure originally contemplated and was rising steadily. Massachusetts is one of the latest states to be organized. Here, in the stronghold of the original and more conservative suffrage Association, under the very eaves of The Woman's Journal, a branch of the militant Congressional Union has been formed, drawing off into its membership many of the active and conspicuous leaders in the older organization.

The feud between the two suffrage groups manifested itself at Washington during the recent hearings before the Congressional committees, when Dr. Shaw, Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt and other leaders of the National Association told the committees that they did not approve of the militant methods of the Congressional Union, and that they were non-partisan in their appeals. It manifested itself again when the National Association, at its annual convention, rejected the proposal of the Congressional Union leaders that the two organizations

"affiliate"; and based its rejection upon the fact that "the Congressional Union does not renounce nor pledge itself not to resume what is termed its anti-party policy and what they designate as their election policy; also because it is their intention, as announced by them, to organize in all States for Congressional work, thus duplicating organizations already existing."

That the Congressional Union will succeed, at no distant day, in smashing the National Association, seems highly probable. The Union is already the dominant force in suffrage counsels, and it is likely to push its advantage until the older organization is practically eliminated. But this accession to power of the radical suffrage forces will strengthen rather than weaken the anti-suffrage cause; for it will reveal with increasing clearness the real drift of the suffrage movement and the goal toward which it moves.

THE SUFFRAGE LOBBY

Representative Byrnes of South Carolina has fallen under suffragist displeasure because he ventured to offer a resolution in the House of Representatives calling for an investigation of the suffrage lobby at Washington.

Mr. Byrnes would like to know how the Congressional Union fund to secure the enactment of the Susan B. Anthony amendment, which has already passed the $100,000 mark, is being used. Similar curiosity may well be felt regarding the $50,000 fund of the National Woman Suffrage Association. It is difficult to understand how such large sums of money can be employed legitimately for such a purpose. If it were known that an association of manufacturers, bankers or railway managers had established such a fund to procure favorable consideration from Congress of some measure in which they were interested, it would create a national scandal. Yet, as Mr. Byrnes says, when Congress ordered the Mulhall investigation, there was much less evidence of lobbying and button-holing of Congressmen in the interest of tariff legislation than there has been in this Congress in the interest of the suffrage amendment. Mr. Byrnes complains that the time of members has been taken up by women visiting their offices to lobby for this amendment, and he thinks that Congress is entitled to know whether they are paid agents or volunteers. He is the more strenuous in pressing the inquiry because, as he justly says, one of the arguments in favor of equal suffrage has been that it would tend to purify politics, and among other things stop the use of money for the purpose of influencing legislative bodies.

Mr. Byrnes' curiosity is abundantly justified; but, if his were a close district, he might expect to see bands of Congressional Union suffragettes patrolling it next fall, to punish him for his temerity.

MRS. BELMONT'S SLOGAN

Speaking at the Copley-Plaza on the 3rd of February, at a meeting held in the interest of the newly-organized Massachusetts branch of the Congressional Union, Mrs. O. H. Belmont, chairman of the New York branch, and chief financier of the movement, said that the reason that Massachusetts suffragists were not successful at the November election was that they were "too patient." "If the women of Massachusetts would only organize and use the right methods" she said "they could get the vote."

There was no apparent lack of organization among Massachusetts suffragists in the recent campaign, and there certainly was no lack of money. The chief embarrassment under which they labored was that they had only a small minority of Massachusetts women with them; and the men of the State, from Berkshire to Cape Cod, in the little towns and in the large cities, realized this fact, and voted two to one on the side of the great majority of the women. This great majority have no occasion to feel impatient. They are extremely well pleased.

But what does Mrs. Belmont mean by the "right methods" through which Massachusetts suffragists might achieve their ends? Perhaps we have the answer to this question in the interview which Mrs. Belmont published in the New York World, March 18, 1912, as follows:

"Women in America will choose their own militant methods, and use them, too, without waiting very much longer. I believe there are millions of women who are ready to go to the lengths of actual warfare if they can prevail in no other way."

"And you think the war would be successful?" asked the interviewer.

"It would have to be. The men of America aren't going to kill all the women, or even stand by and watch some men do it. If one state started such a struggle the others would unite. Women would be shot down, but others would take their places. And in the meantime they would have the satisfaction of knowing that men were being shot and killed. The women would have to win in the end."

Declining to set any time when the predicted war was likely to begin, Mrs. Belmont said: "I can't say when other women will come to the point of revolt, but I can speak for myself and I know that I don't intend to stand very much more." That was four years ago, and in the interval, Mrs. Belmont has had to "stand" the defeat of woman suffrage at the polls in eleven great states. It is futile to try to imagine her present mental condition, if she was on the verge of explosion in March, 1912.

Happily, Massachusetts women are not likely to be attracted by her slogan. But it is instructive to observe that the new suffrage organization which is elbowing the older group aside is led by women who would out-Pankhurst the Pankhursts, if they dared.

THE PROPOSED FEDERAL AMENDMENT

WHAT SOME CONGRESSMEN THINK OF IT

(Congressman Stafford of Wisconsin to a suffrage delegation, Nov. 18, 1915.)

I DO not consider suffrage a national question, which to me was a sufficient reason for voting against it last January. If all the states save Wisconsin wanted equal suffrage, and only a small portion of the women in this state favored it, I hope those states would not impose upon Wisconsin what Wisconsin does not want and is not trying to impose on them. If the people of Illinois want suffrage, that is their business and not Wisconsin's.

(Congressman Tilson of Connecticut to a suffrage delegation, Nov. 12, 1915.)

THE argument that you have so strongly urged, that woman suffrage is going to win out eventually, and that I ought to mount the band wagon while mounting is good, does not appeal to me in the least. It is the pet article in the code of the political opportunist, but I do not belong in that class. If I believe a measure to be wrong I should oppose it though I stand alone. If in my judgment, it is too early for the adoption of a policy I shall not support it though it be apparent that it will be adopted next year. No, "eventually, why not now?" does not carry weight with me. In my humble judgment, you have not yet made a good case for the adoption of an amendment to the Federal constitution.

(Congressman McGillicuddy of Maine to a suffrage delegation, Nov. 3, 1915.)

I SAT through many committee hearings when the Mondell resolution came up and I voted against it. I do not think this is the best way to proceed. I do not see why it is not better to go to the States. To be candid, I hesitate to vote suffrage on to a State that does not want it, and I see no need for doing it.

(Senator Pomerene of Ohio to a suffrage delegation, Jan. 7, 1916.)

EQUAL suffrage has not become a question for the Federal Government. I believe it is a question to be settled by each state. While not unfriendly to suffrage, I am not in favor of forcing it on states that do not want it.

HELP FOR IOWA

THE REMONSTRANCE ventures to appeal to individual suffragists in Massachusetts and the other states which have just passed through suffrage campaigns to give what assistance they can to the anti-suffrage cause in Iowa, and to give it quickly.

The Iowa anti-suffragists have extended their organization from a State Committee, which served the purpose sufficiently in former years, to a State Association, with branches in various parts of the State; and they will receive aid and counsel from the National Association. But the situation there is exceptional, because the vote is to be taken, not in November as in the other campaign states, but on the 5th of June, at the primaries. Every day counts, therefore; and the case is the more urgent because a decisive anti-suffrage victory in Iowa will be of great assistance in the campaigns in South Dakota and West Virginia.

Contributions for the Iowa campaign may be sent to the National Association, for use in that State; or direct to the State Association. But, besides help of this sort, much may be done through individual effort and influence, through personal acquaintance, by correspondence and by the distribution of literature. Such assistance will greatly reenforce the Iowa anti-suffragists in the short and strenuous campaign which is before them. The conservative influences which, for more than twenty years, restrained the Iowa legislature from yielding to the repeated attacks of the suffragists, should make themselves felt at the polls in June in a large majority against the suffrage amendment.

ILLINOIS SUFFRAGISTS DISAPPOINTED

THE Supreme Court of Illinois has set a limit to the political activities of the women of that State. The suffragists had assumed that, as the limited suffrage bill enacted by the Legislature had given women the right to vote for Presidential electors, they would also have the right to vote for precinct, ward and state committeemen, and for delegates to national conventions; and the easy-going Election Commission of Chicago took that view, though Attorney General Lucey ruled to the contrary.

The Supreme Court by a unanimous decision, the seven justices concurring, has decided against the suffragists. Under the existing law, women are entitled to vote for all statutory officers not named in the Constitution, and at primary elections for the nomination of such officers as they may vote for at the election for which the primary is held. But the Court very justly rules that candidates for delegates to national conventions are not nominated, but elected, at the April primaries; and that there is nothing in the Act in question which gives women the right to vote in such an election. The Legislature could have given them this right, but it did not, and whether it meant to do so is beside the question.

Some suffragists are trying to derive consolation from this decision on the ground that it practically sustains the constitutionality of the law. But this is not the case; as the Court very properly limited its decision to the single point submitted. It is significant to note, in this connection, that Helen Stewart, 2nd Vice President of the Illinois Equal Suffrage Association, writing in The Woman's Journal for February 26, says: *"We did not feel it at all wise to allow the matter of our whole bill to be brought up before the Supreme Court, even for the sake of voting for the important offices that were in question at this time."*

This is practically an admission that the Illinois suffragists feel their position, under the enactment of 1913, to be so insecure that they do not dare to have it go before the Su-

preme Court. It will be remembered that it was only by a majority of one that the original decision of the Court sustaining the law was secured, and that only after an active suffrage campaign against the reelection of a judge who was thought to be hostile. The composition of the Court has been changed since then; and, in a suit now pending which involves the constitutionality of the whole law, it is possible that the enactment, which was hurried through the Legislature under pressure of a secret lobby, may be overthrown. The letter quoted betrays an apprehension of such a result.

IS PRESIDENTIAL SUFFRAGE CONSTITUTIONAL?

APROPOS of the attempt of the New York suffragists, in spite of their overwhelming defeat at the polls, to induce the Legislature to enact a Presidential suffrage bill, a presentation of the constitutional aspects of the question, in which three eminent lawyers, Mr. Everett P. Wheeler, Mr. Francis Lynde Stetson and Mr. Henry W. Hayden concur, is important, not only in New York but in Massachusetts and other states in which similar attempts are made.

The question at issue is the extent of the power of the Legislature to determine the method of appointment of Presidential electors. The Constitution of the United States, article II, section I, provides for the selection of Presidential electors by the States, as follows:

"Each state shall appoint, in such manner as the Legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress."

The question is whether the Legislature, in enacting its directions for such appointment of Presidential electors, is or is not limited by the provisions of the Constitution of the State. It is plain that the Legislature, as a part of its general legislative power, may determine whether the electors shall be appointed by itself, or be elected by the electors of the State; but, if the electors are to be chosen by the electors of the State, the power which the Legislature has is that conferred upon it by the people, as expressed in the Constitution of the State, and no more. The limitations of the power of the Legislature on the question of suffrage are defined as follows in the first article of the Constitution of New York:

"Section 1, Qualifications of Voters.—Every male citizen of the age of twenty-one years who shall have been a citizen for ninety days, and an inhabitant of this State one year next preceding an election, and for the last four months a resident of the county, and for the last thirty days a resident of the election district in which he may offer his vote, shall be entitled to vote at such election in the election district of which he shall at the time be a resident, and not elsewhere, for all officers that now are or hereafter may be elective by the people, and upon all questions which may be submitted to the vote of the people."

Here, then, is the plain provision of the Constitution of New York which limits the legislative authority in the matter of suffrage. It is absurd to suppose that the framers of the Constitution of the United States, who were careful to respect the provisions of state constitutions regarding the election of members of Congress, and stipulated that the electors who elected them should have "the qualifications necessary for electors of the most numerous branch of the State Legislature" ever intended to confer on Legislatures the power—in the matter of the choice of Presidential electors—to do that which they were prohibited from doing by the State Constitutions. The question falls clearly within the principle stated by Mr. Justice Cooley in his work on Constitutional Limitations (7th ed.) 902:

"Wherever the Constitution has prescribed the qualifications of electors, they cannot be changed or added to by the Legislature or otherwise than by an amendment of the Constitution."

The conclusion reached by the three eminent lawyers referred to is thus stated:

"The Constitution of New York was adopted and can only be amended by a direct vote of the people, and they have just refused to strike out the word 'male' by a majority of 195,000. Members of the Legislature are the servants and delegates of the people, elected to enact and carry out their will, expressed according to law. They are sworn to support the Constitution of the State. No State law in violation of this Constitution is valid.

"Because our Constitution limits the right of suffrage to male citizens of a certain age, and possessing the other constitutional qualifications above set forth, to be ascertained and determined by the election laws, we are of the opinion that the Legislature has no power to pass an act extending the suffrage to females, either for the election of Presidential electors or any State or Federal candidates, and that any act purporting to do so would be unconstitutional and void."

ANOTHER SUFFRAGE INVENTION

THE WOMAN'S JOURNAL stops at nothing in its attempts to malign anti-suffragists. It has given columns of space to the Federal investigation of the political activities of brewers in Pennsylvania and New York, under such headings as these: "U. S. Probe Uncovers Brewers' Anti Fund," "Expected to Disclose the Use of Large Sums Against Suffrage in Four Campaign States Last Fall." The fact is that the Federal investigation had nothing to do with anti-suffrage, and nothing to do with last fall's elections. It related to the Presidential and Congressional elections of 1912 and the indictments found by the Federal Grand Jury March 3rd were for alleged conspiracy in September of that year.

THE ANTI-SUFFRAGE LUNCHEON

THE annual luncheon of the Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts, at the Hotel Somerset, January 17th, was attended by 600 members and guests; and the enthusiasm with which the speakers were received proved that Massachusetts anti-suffragists are firm in their resolve to follow up the great victory achieved last November.

Mrs. John Balch of Milton, President of the Association, presided, and in her opening remarks directed attention to the opportunity for far-reaching and concerted work under the National Association, and appealed for new members, and an increase in the number of Branches, of which there are now 137. Mrs. Balch introduced speakers from the four campaign states of 1915, who gave incidents of the campaign and described some of their own personal experiences.

Mrs. Henry Preston White gave sprightly reminiscences of the Massachusetts campaign; Miss Clara Vezin, campaign manager for New Jersey and Miss Florence R. Hall, chairman of the publicity committee of the Pennsylvania Association, gave interesting details of the methods followed in their respective states; and Miss Lucy Price, Field Secretary of the Ohio Association, who had an active part in the speaking campaign in New York, combined with a rapid resume of methods and results in that state a most convincing appeal for help in the campaigns this year in Iowa, South Dakota and West Virginia. She insisted on the importance of continued work along educational lines, referred to the impression which had been made in Washington by anti-suffrage leaders, and called attention to the striking way in which anti-suffrage majorities have coincided with the efforts of anti-suffrage associations. She was heartily applauded when she gave as an anti-suffrage slogan: "Where we work we win." Speaking as a Western woman, and one who is proud of the West, she said that it takes more to rouse the West to the seriousness of a situation than to rouse New England, and that the Antis of the West must have some help from New England conscientiousness. Describing some of the incidents in the New York campaign, she told how it reached the point where the Suffrage Association refused to meet the Antis in debate, giving as one reason: "The Antis have an unfair advantage. They can flatter the men by telling them that they trust them and are willing to leave the management of their governmental affairs in masculine hands." But where, asked Miss Price, is the unfairness in this? The most obvious and indisputable thing about the anti-suffrage movement is that we do trust the men and are willing to leave in their hands the management of our governmental affairs. As an instance of suffragist exaggeration she cited the direct claim of New York suffragists that one million women of that state had signed the suffrage slips—the only basis for the claim being an estimate based on a straw vote on the subject which was taken by the New York World. Only fifteen per cent. of those who were addressed answered; and, by taking that proportion of the fifteen per cent. who answered favorably and applying it to all the women in the State, the suffragists reached the one million figure. Emphasizing the important influence of the anti-suffrage victories in the East last fall, she said that, if the result of those elections had been different, the suffragists in her own State, Ohio, would hardly have decided to postpone further effort for a suffrage amendment.

After the speaking, the question box was conducted by Mrs. William Lowell Putnam.

WHAT, WOMEN "GRAFTERS"?

MRS. PAGE WALLER EATON, head of the bureau of social survey in Chicago, under Mrs. Louise Osborne Rowe, commissioner of the bureau of public welfare, charges that she was compelled for months to pay over about one-third of her $3,000 salary to Mrs. Rowe. The payments were made, she states, in semi-monthly instalments. Mrs. Rowe refused to receive them in checks, and they were paid in cash. Mrs. Eaton, it appears, was in fear of immediate dismissal, if she did not meet the demand upon her; but finally, the matter came before the city council and the civil service commission for investigation, and the city council committee voted unanimously to present the evidence to the state's attorney, to be submitted to the grand jury.

To Illinois suffragists, anxious to prove that women have exercised a purifying influence, since they were given the municipal vote, less than three years ago, this incident is disturbing. The transaction of a "split salary" is not unknown among mere men who are in office, but that it should turn up so soon in Chicago, in two of the most important offices held by women, is a surprise. Chicago suffragists are apprehensive of the effect upon their cause, and the New York Evening Post reports Mrs. Catherine Waugh McCulloch as saying:

"If any woman does anything wrong in any way, it is an argument against suffrage. There is no denying it. There's no logic in it. The whole country is looking at Chicago. We have to be on our good behavior. It must be said, however, that neither of the women involved was backed by suffrage organizations. But even so, we shall be judged by the conduct of two women."

MRS. VAN WINKLE, President of the Woman's Political Union of New Jersey, is following the example of Mrs. Harriot Stanton Blatch, President of the New York Union, in seeking a legal residence in Kansas, so as to secure a chance to vote. Not a single anti-suffragist has been heard to protest against these migrations.

NOTHING "INSIDIOUS" HERE

In her speech at Ford Hall February 25th, Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt, President of the National Woman Suffrage Association, is reported as describing Robert N. Turner of Massachusetts as an agent of "an invisible, wealthy, insidious and unknown organization that is the biggest factor in preventing woman suffrage from becoming an actuality in the United States."

Mrs. Catt must have been in a desperate state of mind if she imagined that she could advance the suffrage cause in Massachusetts by conjuring up a bogey of this kind. Mr. Turner is the counsel of the Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts and of the Men's Committee which cooperated in last year's campaign. He rendered splendid service in the campaign; and there was nothing "insidious" or "invisible" either about him or the Association which he represented. As for the Association being "unknown," that is rather an absurd accusation to bring against an organization which, for more than twenty years has resisted the efforts of the suffragists to force the vote upon women who do not want it.

If Mrs. Catt wants to revive her drooping cause in this State, she will have to resort to other expedients.

WHY THEY ASK IT

The avowed purpose of the Congressional Union "drive" at Congress is "to compel the passage of the Susan B. Anthony suffrage amendment to the Constitution" through "the power of the women voters of the western states."

Reduced to its simplest terms, this is an attempt to coerce the majority through a minority. If we take into account only the eleven states which have voted against suffrage during the last four years, they have a combined population almost five times as large as the combined population of the eleven suffrage states. What the Congressional Union asks is that the states where women have full suffrage shall coerce populations which are five times as large; or, taking the whole country into account, shall coerce populations which are more than twelve times as large. And to this end, it is proposed to make Nevada, with a population of 81,875, offset New York, with a population of 9,113,279; Wyoming, with a population of 145,965, offset Pennsylvania, with a population of 7,665,111; and Arizona, with a population of 204,354, offset Massachusetts, with a population of 3,366,416.

And it is not only the plan of the Congressional Union to have the minority coerce the majority, but to do this over the heads of the voters—without allowing voters anywhere to express themselves upon the direct issue. Miss Alice Paul, the national head of the Union, said plainly at the Union banquet in Washington last December: "The time for the state referendum is passed. I never want to hear another suffrage speech again. It is no use trying another state campaign."

The underlying motive of the Federal-amendment campaign could not be more clearly disclosed. It aims to substitute minority for majority rule and to override the voters.

A MERITED REBUKE

Iowa suffragists, like those in Massachusetts, are vilifying their opponents by charging them with acting in alliance with the saloons. High-minded and earnest women, leaders in the churches and in charities, are told to their faces that they are in the pay of the liquor interests, because they oppose the movement to thrust women into politics. This has been carried so far that a paper like the Sioux City Journal, itself committed to suffrage, administers the following rebuke:

"The suffragists insist that the liquor interests are opposed to votes for women. In all likelihood this is true. But in the interest of fairness the suffragists must differentiate between opposition of such selfish, mercenary sort and opposition of reputable women who cannot bring themselves to favor suffrage. The suffragists cannot tar some of the best women of Iowa with the same stick with which they tar brewers and distillers and saloonkeepers and hope to make capital out of it for their cause. It would be hard to think up a poorer piece of politics.

"In the middle west, of which Iowa is such an important part, nothing is more popular than the square deal. Let the suffragists tie to that policy in the assurance that it will get them everything that is coming to them. It is a square deal which the suffragists demand from the men. Let them accord a square deal to sisters who hold opinions different from theirs."

At the testimonial dinner to Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt in New York, one of the leading suffrage speakers, Mrs. Charles L. Tiffany, announced her conviction that four men out of five vote as their families want them to. That is perfectly true, and it accounts for the overwhelming vote against suffrage in the four great campaign states last fall.

Congressman Keating of Colorado, speaking before the Boston Equal Suffrage Association March 17, told his auditors that the proposed Federal suffrage amendment would not become part of the Constitution "until the stubborn eastern states first grant women the right to vote," and he added that the voters in these states, although in a receptive mood, "feel the women themselves are opposed to suffrage." The next time that Boston suffragists invite a speaker from Colorado, they will look for one who is a shade less candid than Mr. Keating.

MORE REASONS WANTED

(From the Chicago Tribune (suffragist), March 9, 1916)

People are demanding more substantial reasons for suffrage than they did in 1912. It is not enough to say that it is inevitable or that the women should be given votes because they want them. Few people believe today that the women will effect any immediate sweeping reform in politics.

HECKLING THE PRESIDENT

(From the New York World, Jan. 29, 1916.)

How many times must President Wilson restate to the Woman Suffragists his position on the issue which absorbs their attention to the exclusion of all others? On a number of occasions he has made clear to them that he believes "we ought to work this thing out State by State." In New Jersey last fall he voted for the Woman-Suffrage Constitutional Amendment, and he will do so again when the opportunity offers. But he does not favor the short-cut through an amendment to the Constitution of the United States. In that respect he is in accord with very many confirmed Woman Suffragists who do not take their principles or methods from the Congressional Union.

It should be possible for the President of the United States to visit New York without being besieged in his hotel by hundreds of women or bombarded with notes from them. Is it to become the mark of distinction of certain nagging Suffragists that they set themselves above the ordinary rules of courtesy and reason in such circumstances?

(From the New York Times, Jan. 28, 1916.)

WHEN the President came to New York his plans for the time he had to spare here were all complete. They did not include a hearing for a company of women determined to force from him another expression of his views regarding Federal interference with a matter that rests entirely with the States. He had two important addresses to deliver, and he had to prepare them. He certainly needed what rest he could get during the day. Yet 200 delegates from the Woman's Congressional Union, with whom he had made no appointment, to whom he had distinctly refused to speak, assembled in his hotel early in the morning, and pestered him and his secretary with notes until he felt compelled to see them and say once more that he is unalterably opposed to an amendment to the Federal Constitution granting the franchise to women.

It was a proceeding extremely discreditable to every woman concerned in it. The cause of woman suffrage can scarcely be helped by such behavior. We cannot imagine any deputation of men in like circumstances persisting in an effort to harass the Chief Magistrate of the nation, for to harass him was the only object of these unruly women, since his view on the matter of Federal interference with the right to vote had already been clearly stated.

THOSE FOUR MILLION WOMEN

THE REMONSTRANCE has more than once called attention to the falsity of the suffrage claim to represent four million women voters in the suffrage states; and it now takes pleasure in noting the fact that Mrs. Catt herself, President of the National Woman Suffrage Association, admits that it is baseless. Speaking at the Congressional Conference of the Woman Suffrage Party in New York, February 24, Mrs. Catt, as reported in the New York Tribune, said:

"There never were four million women voters in the Western suffrage states. The total number of women is only 3,700,000. Two-thirds of the men in other states are eligible to vote, and it is only proper to suppose that the same proportion holds true of women. That makes about 2,300,000 on the voting list, and only 80 per cent. of these can be counted on to go to the polls and vote. That brings the four million down to less than two."

That is about the way that THE REMONSTRANCE has figured it; and it is reassuring to have its estimate confirmed by so high a suffrage authority.

Incidentally, Mrs. Catt's statement is significant, because it puts her into direct opposition to Miss Alice Paul and the other Congressional Union leaders, who have been using this imaginary phalanx of four million women voters as a menace to Congress. Apparently, it was Miss Paul and her associates whom Mrs. Catt had in mind, when she added: "Suffragists make a great mistake when they don't tell the truth and the whole truth." Altogether, Mrs. Catt's speech is not likely to allay the feud between the rival suffrage organizations.

SUFFRAGE DISAPPOINTMENTS

IN New Jersey, the Hennessy Presidential suffrage bill, upon which the suffragists had concentrated their efforts, was adversely reported February 29, and the adverse report was accepted by the Senate March 7.

In Maryland and in Oklahoma, as has so often happened before, one branch of the Legislature raised the suffragists' hopes by a favorable vote, while the other branch killed the bill. In Oklahoma it was the House that voted for the proposed amendment, and the Senate that killed it. In Maryland, it was the other way around. The Senate passed the bill to a third reading, and the House killed it by a vote of 64 to 36.

In South Carolina and in Virginia, the proposal was defeated in the House.

In Kentucky, March 2, a motion in favor of the proposed amendment was defeated.

In Canada, the suffragists secured favorable action on provincial suffrage bills in Manitoba and Alberta —two of the newest provinces—and tried to get a resolution through the Canadian Parliament giving women the right to vote at Federal elections in provinces where they could vote at provincial elections; but the House of Commons rejected the resolution February 28.

WOULD NOT BE BROWBEATEN

The Judiciary Committee of the national House of Representatives has refused to be browbeaten by the truculent suffragists of the Congressional Union. On the 15th of February, it voted to postpone consideration of the proposed suffrage amendment until December 14. Later, under severe pressure, it decided to reopen the question, but, on the 28th of March, it voted to postpone the matter indefinitely, and took the same action on other pending propositions for the amendment of the Constitution. The suffragists had flooded the members of the Committee with letters and telegrams, had waylaid them in and about the Capitol, and had threatened them with political extinction; but they stood firm in their resolve not to introduce this disturbing question when the country was in the midst of a grave crisis. So, the Federal suffrage question is shelved and is likely to stay shelved.